MINUTES
TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
DATA COMMITTEE MEETING
March 22, 2017 at 1:00 p.m.
Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Room
2700 Port Lansing Road
Lansing, Michigan

** Frequently Used Acronyms Attached

Members Present:
Bill McEntee, CRA - **Chair**   Jonathan Start, MTPA/KATS
Rob Surber, DTMB/CSS   Jennifer Tubbs, MTA
David Wresinski, MDOT - **Vice Chair** via Telephone

Support Staff Present:
Rob Balmes, MDOT   Roger Belknap, MDOT
Gil Chesbro, MDOT   Dave Jennett, DTMB/CSS
Hugh McNichol, MDOT   Gloria Strong, MDOT
Bill Tansil, MDOT   Mike Toth, MDOT

Members Absent:
Bob Slattery, MML

Others Present:
Jim Snell, TCRPC

1. **Welcome - Call-To-Order – Introductions:**
The meeting was called-to-order at 1:13 p.m. Jim Snell from Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (TCRPC) was introduced and welcomed to the meeting.

2. **Public Comments on Non-Agenda Items:**
The April 5, 2017 Administration, Communication, and Education (ACE) and Full Council Meetings are canceled and rescheduled to April 19, 2017, at their normal times. Data and Full Council may also need to hold a combined meeting on April 26, 2017 at 1:00p.m., if the annual report is not adopted at the April 19, 2017 Full Council meeting.

3. **Correspondence and Announcements – R. Belknap**
    3.1. - Reporting 2016 Conditions – *G. Chesbro*
    G. Chesbro gave a presentation of the Pavement Cycle of Life 2013-2014 to 2015-2016 and 2012-2013 to 2014-2015; this year a total of 4% moved to good. Moving from fair to poor is about the same. It showed the percent of total lane miles that are good, fair, poor and the directions they are moving. A data map of the shared data was provided on non-federal aid rated roads in 2016 showing good, fair, and poor roads. Some agencies have

not shared their data. A slide was also shown on paved non-federal aid good, fair, and poor roads. G. Chesbro will analyze data provided from good to poor with the possible treatments to see if there is some correlation.

3.2. - Transportation Asset Management Council (TAMC) Spring Conference, May 25, 2017, Mount Pleasant, Michigan
The preparation for the conference is moving along nicely. The conference will be held May 25, 2017 at the Comfort Inn and Suites Hotel and Conference Center in Mount Pleasant, Michigan. The Save-the-Date has been shared and the Conference Planning Committee is completing the agenda.

3.3. – Michigan Road Preservation Association Annual City/County Workshop, March 31, 2017, Mt. Pleasant
TAMC was asked to have dashboards and an interactive maps exhibit at the workshop.

4. **Consent Agenda:**
   4.1. - Approval of the February 22, 2017 Meeting Minutes (Action Item)
   J. Tubbs made a motion to approve the meeting minutes of February 22, 2017; J. Start seconded the motion. The motion was approved by all members present.

5. **Work Program:**
   5.1. – FY 2017-2019 Data Committee Work Program
   5.1.1. – Regional and Metropolitan Planning Agency Unified Work Program (UWP) Update – J. Start
   J. Start and Derek Bradshaw are working with MDOT's Statewide Planning Section (John Watkin) to rewrite the Unified Work Plan (UWP) for the Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) and Regional Planning Organizations (RPOs). A second draft of the program has been completed. The subcommittee will have another meeting to review the second draft. The MPO UWP's are now being completed. If TAMC gets the additional $250,000 TAMC will need to decide on how they will allocate those funds. Each MPO/RPO have different needs and TAMC must identify and prioritize the items that they must complete. The MPOs/RPOs need to receive a prioritized list of what TAMC expectations are and given flexibility to complete them. The target date of completion for the UWP is June 1, 2017.

   5.1.2. – Justification for Asset Management Plans – R. Belknap
   This agenda item was not discussed.

   5.1.3. – Asset Management Plan Template – R. Belknap
   This agenda item was not discussed.

5.1.4. – 2016 TAMC Annual Report – H. McNichol

The Annual Report is on schedule except for the report cover. R. Belknap will work with MDOT Graphics Design in the near future to create a cover. H. McNichol has begun updating the report and will have a draft completed for everyone to review and comment by March 31, 2017. The report must be to the Legislature and State Transportation Commission by May 2, 2017. Generally, it is released a couple of days before that. The final report must be approved at the April TAMC meeting. H. McNichol has added a chapter on the Investment Reporting Tool out on SharePoint for the Council to review and comment. The Bridge information has been received and will be reviewed at the March 23, 2017, Bridge Committee Meeting. G. Chesbro still has to do the forecast data graphs. All other graphs are completed. The County Road Association (CRA) would like TAMC to do a graph showing conditions by legal system. On the federal aid graphs shown at the CRA Conference there was some questions on the county primary vs. county local road percentages. They are separate classifications. In the cities a lot are not National Functional Classification (NFC).

5.2. - Budget Update for FY 2016 and FY 2017

A copy of the budget report was provided and reviewed earlier in the month at the full Council TAMC meeting. No comments were made on this at today's meeting.

6. **Review and Discussion Items:**

   6.1. – Data Collection –

   6.1.1. – March 17, 2017 Tri-County Regional Planning Commission (TCRPC) Memorandum – J. Snell

   J. Snell attended the meeting today because his agency has been reviewing the TAMC data collection procedures and protocols, and has some ideas that he was interested in proposing on the FY 2017 Pavement Surface Evaluation and Rating (PASER) Survey Process. Mr. Snell, on behalf of his agency, submitted a memo to TAMC demonstrating their proposal. A copy of the memo was provided to the committee.

   The proposal is as follows:
   1. The first system is Trunklines and 50% of Freeway Ramps - (approximately 670 miles of just trunkline). They proposed to do all the trunklines as one system. *This is the only system that would include MDOT region staff and two TCRPC staff using an MDOT data collection van.

   2. The second system is Eaton County and City of Lansing (formerly odd year rotation) – (approximately 675 miles). *The survey team would be two TCRPC staff and local staff with TCRPC provided vehicle.

3

3. The third system is Clinton, Ingham, and East Lansing (formerly even year rotation) – (approximately 675 miles. *The survey team would be two TCRPC staff and locals when available with TCRPC provided vehicle.

They are not asking for an increase in funding. Last year they left a lot of money on the table. Their staff is very efficient. They have a lot of rural miles that they cover in great numbers very quickly.

*MDOT, TCRPC, and odd year jurisdiction staff will receive formal PASER training in 2017. (TCRPC staff has more than 20 years of combined PASER surveying experience.)

The cost of the truck may be paid over time. Do we charge this vehicle use by the hour or would we apply a state reimbursement rate? TCRPC will have to track and give an estimate to the Council. They will not be asking for more funding for the truck. TCRPC already has left over monies on the table and could possibly use those monies. Therefore, there would not be an increase in funding. They will use a standard van. The only people in this van would be TCRPC staff and county staff. TAMC currently reimburses at $11.65 per mile for local data collection.

For an audit, if there is a pilot there would have to be some kind of connection with what we already have in place. The last audit was good and TAMC must continue to follow our current guidelines. TAMC's policy does not follow what TCRPC is proposing. TAMC would have to do this as a pilot to see if it will work. They need to defend the integrity of the data. How would we address reimbursement? There is benefit for MDOT to see the local system. If TCRPC has time, they are willing to collect local Paved Non-Federal Aid data. TAMC wants to be sure that federal aid data is collected. Snell suggested pulling the $33,000 from the normal procedure and using those monies for the pilot. They plan to do this this year but do not have a time. TCRPC would like to see an approval from TAMC.

J. Tubbs made a motion for Data Committee to recommend to the Full Council to do a pilot of what TCRPC is proposing; J. Start seconded the motion. TAMC must speak with the county, city, and MDOT to see if this is possible for them to achieve. TCRPC feels as long as MPO staff are out there we should be in good shape. The Data Committee requested that R. Belknap look at the current policies for MDOT and TAMC to see if this is possible to do. He will also need to look at the different budgetary needs of each area. This is primarily the federal aid system. The motion was approved by all members present.

6.1.2. – 2017 Paved, Non-Federal Aid Data Collection Reimbursement – R. Belknap

No updates were given.

6.1.3. – Non-Federal Aid Data Collection Policy Update – R. Belknap

The Committee would like to look at the federal aid policy also and want to include necessary information on rolling out the inventory based paved/non-paved federal aid funds.

6.2. – Michigan Tech/Local Technical Assistance Program/Roadsoft Update – T. Colling

6.2.1. – Training Updates

Michigan Technological University (MTU) has already completed two PASER training Webinars and the first on-site training. They have 166 people registered for the Webinars and 265 people registered for the PASER Training. On March 13, 2017, MTU held an Investment Reporting Tool (IRT) sing Roadsoft Webinar.

6.2.2. – Local Agency Capital Preventative Maintenance Extended Treatment Life Study and TAMC Recommendations (p.26)

No updates were given however, a copy of page 26 was provided.

6.3. – Act-51 Distribution and Reporting System and Investment Reporting Tool (IRT) – B. McEntee/R. Belknap

6.3.1. – Warrantee Section of the IRT – R. Belknap

CSS has created in the IRT system a window that will pop open to explain what a reactionary project is. It was suggested that they might want to include crashes and other items that are not natural. A copy of the warrantee's concept for help language in the IRT and Roadsoft was shared with the committee. MTU will be using this as part of their training sessions. Their first training is April 12, 2017. MDOT has proposed to add questions regarding warrantees to the IRT. MDOT will provide the questions and would like to start collecting this information in FY 2018. B. Tansil also spoke with MDOT and CRA regarding warranties and they have a few pieces of data they want to collect but he is not sure how CRA needs align with what MDOT needs. MDOT will be responsible to assure agencies are adhering to what they need. TAMC will not be responsible for anything other than knowing that they have or do not have a warranty on projects $2 million and higher. There will be more discussion and information on this given at a later time.

6.3.2. – Compliance Status and Annual Report Information – R. Belknap

Act 51 agencies are now able to make changes in the Act 51 Distribution and Reporting System. There was PASER information entered but no IRT data. The problem with the IRT data is CSS does not know when the projects were entered.

They could have been entered even as far back as 2006. Their new target date for completion is end of April.

6.4. - Website Update – D. Jennett
Nothing more than what has already been shared.

6.5. - Dashboard Update – D. Jennett
No update was given.

7. <u>Member Comments:</u>
R. Belknap received a request from a company that provides traffic data and wanted PASER (Source GIS) data and requested it from TAMC. The committee decided to send their request to the local agency that they are requesting the information on since they actually collected it.

8. <u>Public Comments:</u>
None

9. <u>Adjournment:</u>
The meeting adjourned at 3:01 p.m. The next meeting will be held March 26, 2017, at 1:00 p.m. in conjunction with TAMC Full Council, MDOT Aeronautics Building, 2nd Floor Commission Conference Room, Lansing.

TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS:	
AASHTO	AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION OFFICIALS
ACE	ADMINISTRATION, COMMUNICATION, AND EDUCATION (TAMC COMMITTEE)
ACT-51	PUBLIC ACT 51 OF 1951-DEFINITION: A CLASSIFICATION SYTEM DESIGNED TO DISTRIBUTE MICHIGAN'S ACT 51 FUNDS. A ROADWAY MUST BE CLASSIFIED ON THE ACT 51 LIST TO RECEIVE STATE MONEY.
ADARS	ACT 51 DISTRIBUTION AND REPORTING SYSTEM
BTP	BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION PLANNING (MDOT)
CPM	CAPITAL PREVENTATIVE MAINTENANCE
CRA	COUNTY ROAD ASSOCIATION (OF MICHIGAN)
CSD	CONTRACT SERVICES DIVISION (MDOT)
CSS	CENTER FOR SHARED SOLUTIONS
DI	DISTRESS INDEX
ESC	EXTENDED SERVICE LIFE
FAST	FIXING AMERICA'S SURFACE TRANSPORTATION ACT
FHWA	FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
FOD	FINANCIAL OPERATIONS DIVISION (MDOT)
FY	FISCAL YEAR
GLS REGION V	GENESEE-LAPEER-SHIAWASSEE REGION V PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
GVMC	GRAND VALLEY METRO COUNCIL
HPMS	HIGHWAY PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM
IBR	INVENTORY BASED RATING
IRI	INTERNATIONAL ROUGHNESS INDEX
IRT	INVESTMENT REPORTING TOOL
KATS	KALAMAZOO AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY

KCRC	KENT COUNTY ROAD COMMISSION
LDC	LAPTOP DATA COLLECTORS
LTAP	LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM
MAC	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES
MAP-21	MOVING AHEAD FOR PROGRESS IN THE 21ST CENTURY (ACT)
MAR	MICHIGAN ASSOCIATION OF REGIONS
MDOT	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
MDTMB	MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TECHNOLOGY, MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
MITA	MICHIGAN INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION
MML	MICHIGAN MUNICIPAL LEAGUE
MPO	METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
MTA	MICHIGAN TOWNSHIPS ASSOCIATION
MTF	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION FUNDS
MTPA	MICHIGAN TRANSPORTATION PLANNING ASSOCIATION
MTU	MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY
NBI	NATIONAL BRIDGE INVENTORY
NBIS	NATIONAL BRIDGE INSPECTION STANDARDS
NFA	NON-FEDERAL AID
NFC	NATIONAL FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION
NHS	NATIONAL HIGHWAY SYSTEM
PASER	PAVEMENT SURFACE EVALUATION AND RATING
PNFA	PAVED NON-FEDERAL AID
PWA	PUBLIC WORKS ASSOCIATION
QA/QC	QUALITY ASSURANCE/QUALITY CONTROL
RCKC	ROAD COMMISSION OF KALAMAZOO COUNTY
ROW	RIGHT-OF-WAY
RPA	REGIONAL PLANNING AGENCY
RPO	REGIONAL PLANNING ORGANIZATION
SEMCOG	SOUTHEAST MICHIGAN COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS
STC	STATE TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION
STP	STATE TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM
TAMC	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
TAMCSD	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT COUNCIL SUPPORT DIVISION
TAMP	TRANSPORTATION ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN
TPM	TRANSPORTATION PERFORMANCE MEASURES
UWP	UNIFIED WORK PROGRAM

S:/GLORIASTRONG/TAMC FREQUENTLY USED ACRONYMS.03.10.2017.GMS